Review of draft monitoring methodologies for SDG 6 global indicators – **Summary of feedback and responses – 6.4.1**

About the review

Between April and November 2016, the draft monitoring methodologies for SDG 6 global indicators were pilot tested at scale in five countries (Jordan, the Netherlands, Peru, Senegal, and Uganda), with the objective to collect feedback on technical feasibility, usefulness for policy making, institutional models for implementation, and capacity requirements.

In addition, between August and October 2016, UN-Water carried out an external review of the draft monitoring methodologies, to collect feedback from country and international experts.

The objective of both of these exercises was to improve the methodologies and inform the process of global rollout of the methodologies starting in 2017.

Below follows a summary of the feedback received for a specific indicator and the response from the indicator's custodian agency(ies).

Summary

Indicator: 6.4.1

Custodian agency/agencies: FAO

Table of Contents

List of sources of feedback

Feedback and responses

Target Team and external review feedback

Feedback	Response
Change the calculation of the indicator, to be based directly on percentage differences over time	The indicator must have a defined value each year. In the IAEG, recently there has been even the proposal to modify the name, without the "change" word in it. However, the proposed formula can be used during the analysis of the indicator, when the change issue will be considered to understand the actual meaning of the data collected.
The service sector efficiency could be scrapped, and only agriculture and industry sectors should be used to compute the indicator, since efficiency in services is however high	Although this is generally true, for now we remain convinced that we need all the sectors, in order to fulfill formally the request of the target, but also because this indicator will show how much the growth of the entire economy is linked to the exploitation of natural water resources
To reflect an increase in water use efficiency in irrigated production, it is paramount to use consumptive water use as input (not total water abstractions).	Although both alternatives seem to have pros and cons, we noted that countries have not proposed to change towards consumption, with the partial exception of Senegal. Moreover, even other proposal, like water use (in SEEA terms) have problems in the lack of data. For the time being, we maintain the use of abstraction as a proposal to the IAEG-SDG However, we are planning to work on an integration of consumptive and non-consumptive use, possibly in a ladder scheme or in supplementary indicators
This approach focuses attention to "blue water". Combined use of soil moisture and water from streams, lakes, reservoirs and aquifers should be considered for valid comparisons	That has been discussed in Senegal and in the Netherlands report. No decision has been taken though to add "green water", which would bias the indicator against irrigation. Moreover, rain and soil water cannot be substantially managed. However, the implications and possible conflict between water conservation practices and water use should be analysed when considering the linkages among different indicators (for example with 2.4.1 in this case)

Water use (and its SEEA definition) should be used for this indicator, and returns not included	It is recognized that the terminology used does not fully match with the one used in SEEA. However, we tried to accommodate and bridge it, for example through the footnote on page 1. Return has been in fact removed from the formula

POC countries feedback

Feedback	Response
The name of the indicator is somehow misleading. Efficiency should be a ratio of volume over volume	This is recognized. Possible alternatives have been discussed, but no solution yet found
The data and information collected will be useful for policy making	
Disaggregating data by sector is useful to support better reporting	This is incorporated in the guidelines
The ratio between irrigated and rainfed agriculture needs to be refined, also considering sub-sectors like aquaculture and livestock	This will be done during this year
The frequency of assessment should be annual (or every 5 years)	There are different opinions on this
The data needed are complex and sometimes difficult to obtain	Technical support will be provided. However, all data needed can be found in internationally available datasets
Inflation rate has to be considered	Done
Rainfed agriculture should be included	